

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 31 and 32 are pending in the present application and have been amended only to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

In addition, a terminal disclaimer has been filed along with this amendment to overcome the non-statutory double patenting rejection of claims 31 and 32. Accordingly, Applicant submits that all currently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §112 2nd Paragraph Rejections

Claims 31-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully submits amended claims which overcome the Examiner's rejection and place the application in condition for allowance.

All of the Examiner's stated reasons for rejecting claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, have been considered and overcome by the amendments to these claims. With regard to the Examiner's argument that the "liquid developer has no clear meaning", Applicant respectfully disagrees. Pages 26-27 of the specification discloses adequate support for the liquid developer as a potential application of the substrate treatment process. One skilled in the art is familiar with a liquid developer as applied to the substrate treatment process. There is no further requirement that the liquid developer be described with any more clear meaning than is described in the specification.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 31 and 32 are in compliance 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Nonstatutory Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 31-32 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of nonprovisional double patenting in view of a prior patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,821,906). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A terminal disclaimer has been filed along with this amendment in an effort to overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejection of claims 31 and 32.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 31 and 32 are in compliance with the doctrine of nonprovisional double patenting. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, at the telephone number listed below.

With best regards,

Very truly yours,
MAIER & MAIER, PLLC



Timothy J. Maier
Registration No. 51,986

128 North Pitt Street, 2nd Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314
1.703.740.8322

Date: October 26, 2006